

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/696,800	Applicant(s) DIETERICH, ROLF	
	Examiner John J. Vrablik	Art Unit 3748	

All Participants:

(1) John J. Vrablik.

(2) Barry R. Lipsitz.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 September 2004

Time: 10:00 AM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 112, second paragraph and obvious type double patenting

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner stated that claim 1 is indefinite and inaccurate for reciting that a portion of the drive shaft which extends between the third radial roller bearing (72) and the second radial roller bearing (54) is adapted to compensate for alignment errors between the three radial roller bearings since the portion of the shaft which compensates for alignment errors is between the third radial roller bearing (72) and the first radial roller bearing (50). Examiner would allow the claim if in line 12, "a portion of" were deleted so that the broader recitation of the drive shaft which extends between the third and second bearings is adapted to compensate for alignment errors, making the claim accurate and allowable. However, such an amendment would raise the question of obvious type double patenting with claim 1 of the parent, Patent No. 6,666,661, which claims the same portion of the shaft adapted to compensate for alignment errors. Attorney will send a supplemental amendment to claim 1, deleting "a portion of" and sending a terminal disclaimer to render the claim allowable..